



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,856

01/03/2006

Karine Deffez

ON/4-32680A

9612

1095

7590

09/18/2009

NOVARTIS
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER

YOUNG, MICAH PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,856	Applicant(s) DEFPEZ ET AL.	
	Examiner MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	Art Unit 1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/8/05, 3/15/06, 12/04/06, 7/7/08, 9/9/08.</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/8/05, 3/15/06, 12/04/06, 7/7/08 and 9/9/08 were timely filed. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Lattmann et al (WO 97/49395 hereafter '395) in view of Patel et al (USPN 5,698,221 hereafter '221).

The '395 patent teaches a dispersible tablet formulation comprising deferasirox/deferacirox, the compound (I) of the instant claims (abstract). The compound is

Art Unit: 1618

present in the formulation in a concentration from 0.1-50% (pg. 10, ¶ 1). The tablets comprise excipients such as fillers like, lactose, sucrose and mannitol, disintegrants such as starches, binders such as polyvinylpyrrolidone, lubricants such as magnesium stearate, glidants, and surfactants (pg. 9, ¶ 3- pg. 8, ¶ 2). The dosage form is administered to a patient in need thereof in a concentration from 20-80 mg/kg (pg. 9 ¶ 3). The compounds are present in free acid and crystal forms (pg. 15, ¶ 6-pg. 16, ¶ 3). The '395 patent discloses a dispersible tablet comprising deferasirox and a series of excipients including fillers, binders, disintegrants, glidants, surfactants and lubricants. The reference is silent to the specific concentrations of these compounds, however their presence and concentrations are well known in the art as seen in the '221 patent.

The '221 patent discloses a dispersible tablet comprising compounds useful for the treatment of Alzheimer's disorders (abstract). The tablets of the reference disperse in less than 2 minutes (col. 2, lin. 38-42). The active compound is present in a concentration from 15-50% of the tablet, and in an amount from 50-800 mg (col. 5, lin. 21-41). The tablet formulation comprises fillers in concentration from 30-50% (col. 7, lin. 25-28), disintegrants up to 30% (col. 5, lin. 55-60), binders from 1-5% (col. 6, lin. 39-42), at least one surfactant from 0.05-1% (col. 7, lin. 45-50), glidants from 0.2-0.5% (col. 7, lin. 55-58) and a lubricant such as magnesium stearate in a concentration from 0.25-1% (col. 7, lin. 29-30). The tablets are formed by mixing the components together, wet granulating them together, along with lubricants, and compressing the dried mixture into tablets (col. 8, lin. 19-col. 9, lin. 15). It would have been obvious to combine the specific formulation of the '221 patent with the formulation of the '395 since both patents disclose dispersible tablets comprising Alzheimer's medications.

Art Unit: 1618

Regarding the specific concentrations and ranges of the instant claims it is the position of the Examiner that these limitations are obviated by the prior art combination. The general conditions of the claims have been met, namely a fast dispersing tablet formulation comprising deferasirox/deferacirox, fillers, disintegrants, binders, surfactants, glidants and lubricants, identical to those of the instant claims. Each components in present in a range either within or close to the concentrations of the instant claims. These result effective parameters affect the stability, processing speed, strength and dispersible time of the fast dissolving tablets. Each of them can be manipulated and optimized in order to arrive at an optimal dispersible tablets. The fillers can be decrease, and disintegrants increased to decrease dissolution time. The binder can be increased and the tablet strength can be increased. These components each have an affect on the overall composition and can each be optimized through routine experimentation. Applicant is reminded that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *See In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Each of the components represents a parameters of the dispersible table effects the dissolution time

Furthermore the claims differ from the reference by reciting various concentrations of the active ingredient(s). However, the preparation of various compositions having various amounts of the active is within the level of skill of one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It has also been held that the mere selection of proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. *See In re Russell*, 439 F.2d 1228 169 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 1618

With these things in mind it would have been obvious to combine the prior art in order to provide an improved dispersible tablet. The '395 patent is suggestive of the inclusion of specific compounds and the '221 patent provides the specific compounds in the appropriate concentration in order to provide an improved formulation and process of making said formulation. The formulation would dissolve quickly providing an immediate dose to the patient in need of relief. The fillers, binders and disintegrants would provide protection from environmental damage, while the lubricants would ease the production of the tablets. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the art as such with an expected result of a stable Alzheimer's drug treatment.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICAH-PAUL YOUNG whose telephone number is (571)272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:30; every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/MICAH-PAUL YOUNG/
Examiner, Art Unit 1618